Continuous variable entanglement generated with a hybrid $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric system

Saeid Vashahri-Ghamsari,[1] Bing He,[1] and Min Xiao[1]

[1] *Department of Physics, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA*

We present a study of generating macroscopic continuous variable entanglement with two coupled waveguides respectively carrying optical damping and optical gain, in addition to a squeezing element into one or both waveguides. We show that quantum noise effect existing in the process is essential to the degree of the generated entanglement. It will totally eliminate the entanglement in the setup of adding the squeezing element into the waveguide filled with optical damping material, but will not completely damp the entanglement to zero in the other configuration of having the squeezing element in the gain medium or in both amplification and dissipation medium. The degree of the generated continuous variable entanglement is irrelevant to the intensities of the input light in coherent states. Moreover, the relations between the entanglement and system parameters are well illustrated in terms of the dynamical evolutions of the created continuous variable entanglement.

arXiv:1612.03996v1 [quant-ph] 13 Dec 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement is a purely quantum mechanical feature that distinguishes quantum systems from their classical counterparts. It is a type of quantum correlation which can find various important applications in quantum computing and quantum information science [1]. Creating entangled quantum states in feasible ways is always a prerequisite in these applications.

Nowadays, there are two main approaches to the quantum information processing: (1) the "digital" approach, in which the information is encoded in systems of discrete degrees of freedom called qubits or qudits. The quantum systems with two distinguishable states, such as two polarization states of a single photon, spin 1/2 electrons, and two lowest energy levels of quantum dots, are the examples of this category; (2) the "analog" approach, in which the quantum correlations are encoded in continuous variables degrees of freedom (CVs) such as quadrature amplitudes of quantized harmonic oscillator, especially those of the electromagnetic field, as well as Josephson junction and Bose-Einstein condensate [2, 3].

Light is good carrier of quantum information as it interacts weakly with the environment. Quantum information encoded in CV states of light enjoys numerous advantages of preparing, manipulating, and measuring, as compared with the photonic qubits [2]. These CV quantum states are often Gaussian states, the manipulation of which is within the reach of current experimental technology. In addition, the properties of the Gaussian states can be quantitatively described [4]. These motivate one to explore the ways of generating entangled Gaussian states.

Entangled light of high intensity is an example of the so-called *macroscopic* entanglement. In principle, strong laser beams in coherent states, a type of Gaussian states, can be entangled to make such macroscopic entanglement via two-mode squeezing. However, two-mode squeezing existing in parametric down conversion is not very suitable to realize the entanglement between two strong light fields. Coupled optical cavities or waveguides alternately carrying gain and loss are among a category of systems that have attracted wide experimental [5–10] and theoretical [11–20] studies recently. In the case of balanced gain and loss, these systems manifest a parity-time ($\mathcal{PT}$) symmetry [21]. One property of such systems is that, when they operate in the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetry broken regime where their coupling intensity is less than the gain/loss rate, the light propagating in the systems can be significantly amplified. By intuition, it makes the realization of entangled output light fields of high intensities possible, simply by adding an element of small squeezing intensity into one of the coupled components.

In most of the previous studies, the light fields in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems are treated as classical ones. When dealing with the entanglement of the light fields, one will also encounter an indispensable factor accompanying their amplification and damping—the quantum noises acting as the random drives from the associated reservoirs. So far only few recent studies [22–24] have considered the effects of the quantum noises in optical $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems, including the hybrid ones with other physical elements added into the systems [25, 26]. As it is well known, quantum entanglement can be fragile under the influence of the environment noises [27, 28]. How they affect the entanglement that could be realized by $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems was still an open question. In this paper, we will present a study of the problem by quantitatively examining the influence of the quantum noises on the generated entanglement with such systems. The comparison between the generated macroscopic quantum entanglement in the absence and presence of amplification and dissipation quantum noise enables one to understand the quantum noise effects in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems more deeply.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we give a rather detailed account of the dynamical process to create the macroscopic entanglement with a hybrid $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric system. The solution to the dynamical equation is presented in terms of the quadratures of the output fields. To illustrate the effect of the added squeezing element, we first discuss how it will influence the output photon numbers in Sec. III. The interplay between the squeezing and quantum noises is also

illustrated with output photon number evolutions. Our main results about the CV entanglement are presented in Sec. IV, where the entanglement generated with three different configurations of the system is illustrated under various parametric choices for the system. The different degrees of entanglement generated in the absence and in the presence of the quantum noises are well compared. Finally, a brief conclusion is made in Sec. V.

II. DYNAMICS OF A HYBRID $\mathcal{PT}$-SYMMETRIC SYSTEM

Virtually most physical systems are open, as they interact with their environment and hence the dynamics of the systems becomes non-Hermitian. The bipartite system of two coupled single-mode gain-loss waveguides in Fig. 1 is an example of such open system interacting with bosonic baths. The waveguide $A(B)$ carries a gain (loss) medium, in which the single-mode field $\hat{a}(\hat{b})$ propagates. Here we only consider the propagation of the light fields at a normal group velocity v_g, neglecting the possible superluminal propagation of the evanescent wave as described in, e.g., [29–31]. The two light fields couple between the waveguides and the effective coupling intensity J can be adjusted by the gap distance. The frequency of both waveguide modes is assumed to be ω_0. The magnitudes of the light field gain rate g and loss rate γ are decided by the used media, and we also neglect the gain saturation by assuming a high saturation intensity for the used gain medium (the inclusion of the realistic gain saturation will not change the qualitative picture for our concerned processes). When they are balanced ($g = -\gamma$), there will be a $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry for the system, as manifested by the effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian

$$H_{\rm PT} = ig\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} - ig\hat{b}^\dagger\hat{b} + J\left(\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b} + \hat{a}\hat{b}^\dagger\right). \tag{1}$$

When $g < J$, the Hamiltonian's eigenvalues are imaginary and the light intensity demonstrates a periodic oscillation ($\mathcal{PT}$-symmetry regime); when $g > J$ the eigenvalues become real, and the intensity of the transmitting light changes from oscillatory to exponentially growing (the symmetry broken regime). The transition happens at $g = J$, the exceptional point. To entangle the light fields, one could add a squeezing element into the waveguides. The squeezing element could be an additional parametric amplifier with the parameter $\epsilon = r\exp(i\theta)$ [32, 33], being described by the Hamiltonian (when it is added into waveguide B)

$$H^S = \frac{i}{2}\left[\epsilon(\hat{b}^\dagger)^2 - \epsilon^*(\hat{b})^2\right]. \tag{2}$$

In Fig. 1, we illustrate the setup with the example of putting a squeezing element into the loss channel, without showing the used pumping fields for amplifications.

The amplification and dissipation of light fields are also accompanied by the quantum noises $\hat{\xi}_a(t)$ and $\hat{\xi}_b(t)$; see Fig. 1. It is impossible to apply the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) to study their effects. Instead we adopt the following stochastic Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} H^I = J\left(\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b} + \hat{a}\hat{b}^\dagger\right) + i\sqrt{2g}\left[\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{\xi}_a^\dagger(t) - \hat{a}\,\hat{\xi}_a(t)\right] \\ +i\sqrt{2\gamma}\left[\hat{b}^\dagger\hat{\xi}_b(t) - \hat{b}\,\hat{\xi}_b^\dagger(t)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

The detailed derivation of this stochastic Hamiltonian is given in [25], and a different notation for the amplification part is used in [22]. The quantum noise operators satisfy the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\hat{\xi}_c^\dagger(t)\hat{\xi}_c(t')\rangle &= 0, \\ \langle\hat{\xi}_c(t)\hat{\xi}_c^\dagger(t')\rangle &= \delta(t-t'), \\ [\hat{\xi}_c(t), \hat{\xi}_c^\dagger(t')] &= \delta(t-t'), \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $c = a, b$.

It is convenient to work with the quadratures of the light fields and quantum noises defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{q}_c &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\hat{c} + \hat{c}^\dagger\right), \\ \hat{p}_c &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\hat{c} - \hat{c}^\dagger\right), \\ \hat{Q}_c &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\hat{\xi}_c(t) + \hat{\xi}_c^\dagger(t)\right), \\ \hat{P}_c &= -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\hat{\xi}_c(t) - \hat{\xi}_c^\dagger(t)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $c = a, b$. Then the Heisenberg-Langevin equation for the system described in Fig. 1 reads [34]

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t}\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t) = M\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t) + \hat{\mathbf{F}}(t) \tag{6}$$



FIG. 1: The coupled gain-loss waveguide system with an added squeezing element into one of the waveguides. The input light fields are in coherent states.

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t) = \left(\hat{q}_a(t),\, \hat{p}_a(t),\, \hat{q}_b(t),\, \hat{p}_b(t)\right)^T, \tag{7}$$

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 & 0 & J \\ 0 & g & -J & 0 \\ 0 & J & -\gamma + r\cos\theta & r\sin\theta \\ -J & 0 & r\sin\theta & -\gamma - r\cos\theta \end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

is the dynamic matrix, and

$$\hat{\mathbf{F}}(t) = \left(\sqrt{2g}\,\hat{Q}_a(t), -\sqrt{2g}\,\hat{P}_a(t), \sqrt{2\gamma}\,\hat{Q}_b(t), \sqrt{2\gamma}\,\hat{P}_b(t)\right)^T. \tag{9}$$

The solution to the dynamical equations takes the form

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}(t) = \mathrm{e}^{Mt}\hat{\mathbf{X}}(0) + \int_0^t \mathrm{e}^{M(t-t')}\hat{\mathbf{F}}(t')\,\mathrm{d}t'. \tag{10}$$

Now that we are concerned with input coherent states, the evolved quantum states according to the above dynamical equation will be preserved to be Gaussian states. All properties of such Gaussian states can be depicted with the covariance matrix (CM) [2–4]:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ C^T & B \end{pmatrix} \tag{11}$$

where

$$V_{ij} = \langle \hat{X}_i\hat{X}_j + \hat{X}_j\hat{X}_i\rangle - 2\langle\hat{X}_i\rangle\langle\hat{X}_j\rangle. \tag{12}$$

The above matrix element may have a variation form differed by a factor 1/2, depending on the definition of the quadratures. The expectation values of the homogeneous part in (10) are calculated with respect to the input coherent states $|\alpha,\beta\rangle$, while those of the inhomogeneous part are found with respect to the total reservoir state $\rho_{\mathrm{R}} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ (a zero temperature for the reservoirs is assumed).

III. EVOLUTION OF PHOTON NUMBER AND WAVEGUIDE MODE CORRELATION

We first look at how the output light fields' intensities proportional to their photon numbers evolve in the concerned system. Previously, the evolved light intensity in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric system has been studied for input single photon and vacuum state [22]. Due to the amplification noise, the output field intensity will not zero even if the input field is in vacuum state [22]. By adding a squeezing element, the photon number can be enhanced further, in addition to the effect of the medium giving the amplification at the rate g. Fig. 2 shows the intensity plotted for a setup with the squeezing element in the damping waveguide. The photon number will be intensified by increasing the squeezing parameter r. Meanwhile, as shown in Figs. 2(a)-2(d), the quantum noise induced photon number will also be significantly increased as the result of the interplay between the noise drives and squeezing effect. Here we only show the results in the regime $J > g$, as the results for $J < g$ are similar. Notice that the photon number in waveguide A is larger, as one expects for the gain channel. For the evolving photon numbers, quantum noises simply quantitatively modify their values.

Then we check how simple correlations of the light fields will evolve in the concerned systems. Assuming that the squeezing element is inside the damping waveguide, we study one example of such correlations as

$$|\langle\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b}\rangle - \langle\hat{a}^\dagger\rangle\langle\hat{b}\rangle|. \tag{13}$$

The amplification noise significantly contributes to this function. Fig. 3 illustrates the evolution of such function for three different squeezing parameters. As one can expect, the correlation becomes stronger for a larger squeezing parameter.

IV. ENTANGLEMENT OF OUTPUT FIELDS

An interesting question is whether the entanglement of two output light fields can also grow with time, as some of those simple correlations in Fig. 3. If so, it will be possible to realize highly entangled strong light fields with ease. The degrees of the possibly generated entanglement of Gaussian states can be measured by the logarithmic negativity calculated with the CM matrix of the the two system modes:

$$E_N = \max[0, -\ln\eta] \tag{14}$$



FIG. 2: The total photon numbers I_a and I_b out of the gain and loss waveguide, represented by red and blue curves, respectively, as compared with the photon numbers calculated without the noise drives $I_{a,h}$, and $I_{b,h}$ (the dashed red and blue curves). We set the parameters as $\theta = \pi/4$, $J = 1.9g$, and $g = -\gamma$. The squeezing parameter: (a) $r = 0$, (b) $r = 0.5g$, (c) $r = g$, and (d) $r = 1.5g$. The input coherent states are given as $\alpha = \beta = 0.2\exp(i\pi/4)$.



FIG. 3: The correlation function $|\langle\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b}\rangle - \langle\hat{a}^\dagger\rangle\langle\hat{b}\rangle|$ calculated with $J = 1.9g$. We set $g = -\gamma$ and $\theta = \pi/4$. Three different values of squeezing, $r = 0$ (blue), $r = g$ (green), and $r = 1.5g$ (red), are used. The input coherent states are given as $\alpha = \beta = 0.6\exp(i\pi/4)$.

where

$$\eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\sqrt{\Sigma - \sqrt{\Sigma^2 - 4\det V}} \tag{15}$$

and

$$\Sigma = \det A + \det B - 2\det C. \tag{16}$$

The notations used here are from the defined CM in Eq. (11). There is an important property of such entanglement, given the input light fields in coherent states. In the calculation of the elements of CM, the contribution from the homogeneous part in Eq. (10) only manifests from the commutation of the mode operators, after deducting the mean values $\langle\hat{X}_i\rangle\langle\hat{X}_j\rangle$ in Eq. (12). As the result, the intensity of the input coherent states will be irrelevant to the entanglement, the degree of which is greatly influenced by the noise drives giving the inhomogeneous part in Eq. (10).

In what follows, we will study the output entanglement from three distinct setups—the squeezing element is in the damping waveguide, in the amplification waveguide, and in both waveguides.

A. Squeezing element in the damping waveguide

The first situation has the dynamic matrix given in Eq. (8). Without adding the noise drive $\hat{\mathbf{F}}(t)$ that gives the inhomogeneous part in Eq. (10), the output fields will become strongly entangled; see Fig. 4. In the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime as illustrated in Fig. 4(a), the entanglement values are oscillating; in the symmetry broken regime as in Fig. 4(b), the entanglement values continuously grow with time. In both regimes the calculated entanglement without being affected by quantum noises



FIG. 4: Calculated entanglement values without quantum noise effect, when a squeezing element is put into the damping waveguide. We set $g = -\gamma$ and $\theta = \pi/4$ and $J = 1.9g$ in (a), $J = 0.7g$ in (b). The squeezing parameters are chosen as $r = 0.1g$ (blue), $r = 0.7g$ (green), and $r = 1.3g$ (red).

resembles the evolutions of photon numbers in a $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric system. The larger the squeezing is, the higher the entanglement will be.

The realistic entanglement radically differs from those in Fig. 4, after we include the effects of the quantum noises. In this situation of putting a squeezing element into the damping waveguide, the entanglement will be absolutely zero under the existing noise drive $\hat{\mathbf{F}}(t)$. This result clearly demonstrates the significance of the system's interaction with the environment. Compared with the evolution of a correlation function in Fig. 3, the corresponding entanglement behaves in totally different way due to the existence of the noise effect, implying that having one kind of correlation between two system modes is not sufficient to have their entanglement. The entanglement has to be determined by the relations between all correlation functions in Eq. (12) as the elements of the CM defined in Eq. (11).

B. Squeezing element in the gain waveguide

If a squeezing element is inserted into the amplifying waveguide, the dynamic matrix in Eq. (8) will be changed to

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} g + r\cos\theta & r\sin\theta & 0 & J \\ r\sin\theta & g - r\cos\theta & -J & 0 \\ 0 & J & -\gamma & 0 \\ -J & 0 & 0 & -\gamma \end{pmatrix}. \tag{17}$$

The dynamical evolutions of the waveguide modes, as given by Eq. (10), will be changed from the above-mentioned situation.

Now let us look at how the entanglement between the two waveguide mode will become after we swap the location of the squeezing element. In Fig. 5 we illustrate the numerically calculated entanglement values in both $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry broken regime [Figs. 5(a) and 5(c)] and $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry preserved regime [Figs. 5(b) and 5(d)]. One sees that, under the quantum noise effects, there will be certain amount of remnant entanglement, though they are much less significant as compared with the predictions without considering the quantum noise drives. The entanglement evolving under the full dynamics exhibits

a phenomenon of entanglement sudden death (ESD) [28], to have the optimum value obtained as a certain time (equivalent to an optimum waveguide length). By putting the squeezing element into the gain channel, the interplay between the squeezing effect and the quantum noise effects will be different from that in the previous situation of adding the squeezing element in the loss channel. As the result, the entanglement between the waveguide modes will appear for a period of time.



FIG. 5: Entanglement generated by a squeezing element in the gain waveguide. Here we choose $\theta = \pi/4$ and $g = -\gamma$. In (a) and (c) there is $J = 0.7g$, and in (b) and (d) there is $J = 1.9g$. The entanglement values given in (a) and (b) are found with the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in Eq. (1), together with the squeezing action. Those in (c) and (d) are found with the full dynamics including the noise drives. The squeezing parameters are $r = 3.5g$ (red), $r = 3g$ (green), and $r = 2.5g$ (blue).

C. Squeezing elements in both waveguides

At last we will consider the situation of adding squeezing elements into both waveguides. In this situation, the dynamical matrix for the system is

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} g + r\cos\theta & r\sin\theta & 0 & J \\ r\sin\theta & g - r\cos\theta & -J & 0 \\ 0 & J & -\gamma + r\cos\theta & r\sin\theta \\ -J & 0 & r\sin\theta & -\gamma - r\cos\theta \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

Under the condition $g = -\gamma$, the system happens to exhibit a $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry like the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1). In this situation, the entanglement will exhibit more different features. For example, under the quantum noise drives, there will be no entanglement at all if the system is operated in the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry broken regime with $J < g$.

In the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric regime with $J > g$, there will be entanglement generated with the proper lengths of the waveguides, as demonstrated in Fig. 6. Due to the squeezing elements in both waveguides, the generated entanglement can be considerable as indicated by their values in Fig. 6(b). The entanglement will be created from zero along the propagation of the light fields and will evolve to a point of ESD after a period of time, so that an optimum amount of entanglement should be obtained with a proper waveguide length.



FIG. 6: Entanglement generated by putting identical squeezing elements into both waveguides. We set $\theta = \pi/4$, $g = -\gamma$ and $J = 1.9g$. In (a) the entanglement values are calculated without considering quantum noises, and in (b) the entanglement values are found with the full dynamics. The squeezing parameters are $r = 2.7g$ (red), $r = 2g$ (green), and $r = 1.7g$ (blue).

V. CONCLUSION

We have studied the entanglement generated with a hybrid $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric setup, which is realized by adding a squeezing element into two coupled waveguides respectively carrying the medium with the balanced gain and loss rate. By intuition, the existing quantum noises would only modify the dynamics of such systems, to correct the value of the generated entanglement similar to their corrections of the photon numbers illustrated in Fig. 2 and the simple correlations in Fig. 3. Then it is possible to create highly entangled light fields of significant intensity by making use of such systems, especially the systems operating in the $\mathcal{PT}$ symmetry broken regime. As a matter of fact, however, the quantum noises can completely kill the entanglement, rendering its evolution totally different from those of photon numbers and simple waveguide mode correlations. We find that it is necessary to have squeezing element inside the waveguide amplifying the propagating light field, so that a certain amount of the entanglement between the output fields could be obtained. So the possible implementation of such systems depends on finding a material or a method to amplify and squeeze the input light at the same time. The importance of this model setup study is to clarify the fact that quantum noises must be considered in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric optical systems used to engineer the quantum properties of light fields.

[1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information:10th Anniversary Edition*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011.

[2] S. L. Braunstein and P. van Loock, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 513 (2005).

[3] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. Garca-Patrn, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 621 (2012)

[4] G. Adesso, A. Serafini, and F. Illuminati, Phys. Rev. A 70(2), 022318 (2004).

[5] A. Guo, G. J. Salamo, D. Duchesne, R. Morandotti, M. Volatier-Ravat, V. Aimez, G. A. Siviloglou, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 093902 (2009).

[6] C. E. Rüter, K.G.Makris, R. El-Ganainy, D.N. Christodoulides, M. Segev, and D. Kip, Nat. Phys. **6**, 192 (2010).

[7] A. Regensburger, C. Bersch, M. A. Miri, G. Onishchukov, D. N. Christodoulides, and U. Peschel, Nature (London) **488**, 167 (2012).

[8] T. Eichelkraut, R. Heilmann, S.Weimann, S. Stützer, F.Dreisow, D. N. Christodoulides, S. Nolte, and A. Szameit, Nat. Commun. **4**, 2533 (2013).

[9] L. Chang, X. Jiang, S. Hua, C. Yang, J.Wen, L. Jiang, G. Li, G. Wang, and M. Xiao, Nat. Photonics **8**, 524 (2014).

[10] B. Peng, S. K. O zdemir, F. Lei, F. Monifi, M. Gianfreda, G. L. Long, S. Fan, F. Nori, C. M. Bender, and L. Yang, Nat. Phys. **10**, 394 (2014).

[11] R. El-Ganainy, K. G. Makris, D. N. Christodoulides, and Z. H. Musslimani, Opt. Lett. **32**, 2632 (2007).

[12] S. Klaiman, U. Günther, and N. Moiseyev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 080402 (2008).

[13] H. Schomerus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 233601 (2010).

[14] Y. D. Chong, L. Ge, and A. D. Stone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 093902 (2011).

[15] Z. Lin, H. Ramezani, T. Eichelkraut, T. Kottos, H. Cao, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 213901 (2011).

[16] C. M. Bender, M. Gianfreda, S. K. O´zdemir, B. Peng, and L. Yang, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062111 (2013).

[17] X. Luo, J. Huang, H. Zhong, X. Qin, Q. Xie, Yu. S. Kivshar, and C. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 243902 (2013).

[18] R. El-Ganainy, M. Khajavikhan, and L. Ge, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 013802 (2014).

[19] M. H. Teimourpour, R. El-Ganainy, A. Eisfeld, A. Szameit, and D. N. Christodoulides, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 053817 (2014).

[20] S. Longhi, Opt. Lett. **40**, 5694 (2015).

[21] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5243 (1998).

[22] G. S. Agarwal and K. Qu, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 031802(R) (2012).

[23] B. He, L. Yang, Z. Zhang, and M. Xiao, Phys. Rev. A 91, 033830 (2015).

[24] K. V. Kepesidis, T. J. Milburn, J. Huber, K. G. Makris, S. Rotter, and P. Rabl, New J. Phys. **18**, 095003 (2016).

[25] B. He, S.-B. Yan, J. Wang, and M. Xiao, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 053832 (2015).

[26] B. He, L. Yang, and M. Xiao, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 031802(R) (2016).

[27] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 140404 (2004).

[28] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Science, **323**, 598 (2009).

[29] A. A. Stahlhofen and G. Nimtz, Europhys. Lett. 76, 189 (2006).

[30] G. Nimtz, Lect. Notes Phys. **702**, 509 (2006).

[31] Z.-Y. Wang, C.-D. Xiong, and B. He, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 013813 (2007).

[32] R. W. Boyd, *Nonlinear Optics*, third edition, Academic Press, 2008.

[33] G. S. Agarwal and S. Huang, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 043844 (2016).

[34] C. W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.